Sacred Fragmentation: Divine Authority and Decentralized Elite Control in the Holy Roman Empire and Classic Maya City-States

A Comparative Study in Convergent Political Solutions Across Civilizations Without Contact

Thomas J. Bryan, with Claude (Anthropic)

Introduction: The Same Architecture, Built from Different Materials

Sometime around the year 1000 CE, two civilizations operating on opposite sides of the Atlantic Ocean — civilizations that had never communicated, never traded, never heard of each other's existence — were running remarkably similar political experiments. In Central Europe, the Holy Roman Empire was evolving into a decentralized constellation of hundreds of semi-autonomous territories held together by sacred imperial authority, feudal legal obligation, and an ecclesiastical infrastructure that made political obedience a matter of cosmic duty. In the tropical lowlands of Mesoamerica, the Classic Maya were sustaining a civilization of dozens of competing city-states held together by shared divine kingship ideology, ritual calendar systems, and a priestly-scribal infrastructure that made political obedience a matter of cosmic duty.

Neither civilization knew the other existed. There was no possible mechanism for cultural transmission, borrowing, or imitation. The Atlantic Ocean separated them absolutely. Their languages were unrelated. Their religions shared no common ancestry. Their technologies had developed independently — the Maya never used the wheel for transport or iron for tools, while Europeans never developed the Long Count calendar or the vigesimal mathematical system. Their agricultural bases were different: wheat, barley, and livestock in Europe; maize, beans, and squash in Mesoamerica. Their writing systems emerged from entirely separate traditions. Their art, architecture, music, and mythology bore no resemblance to each other in content.

And yet, when you strip away the surface details — the Gothic cathedrals and the stepped pyramids, the Latin masses and the bloodletting rituals, the feudal charters and the hieroglyphic

stelae — what emerges underneath is the same political architecture. Both civilizations arrived at decentralized systems of competing territorial units bound together by shared sacred ideology and managed through elite networks that balanced local autonomy against collective coordination. Both positioned their rulers as divinely sanctioned intermediaries between cosmic forces and earthly welfare. Both used monumental architecture as propaganda. Both controlled information through restricted literacy systems operated by specialized interpretive classes. Both extracted wealth through obligations framed as religious duty rather than political coercion. Both managed elite competition through marriage alliances, ceremonial display, and graduated hierarchies of status and privilege.

This convergence demands explanation, and the explanation cannot be cultural diffusion because diffusion was impossible. The argument of this study is that the convergence reflects structural logic: when certain conditions obtain — political fragmentation following the collapse of centralized authority, ecological diversity creating multiple resource bases, and elite competition generating pressure for legitimation beyond military force — the resulting political solutions converge regardless of cultural content. The sacred decentralized polity is not a European invention or a Mesoamerican invention. It is a structural response to a particular configuration of problems that human societies encounter repeatedly, and the solutions look similar because the problems are similar.

What makes this comparison particularly powerful within the framework of elite power analysis is what it reveals about the relationship between belief infrastructure and political fragmentation. Both the Holy Roman Empire and the Maya city-states demonstrate that apparent political weakness — the inability or unwillingness to centralize — can serve elite interests more effectively than centralization. In both cases, fragmentation prevented any single rival from accumulating enough power to challenge the overarching system, while shared sacred ideology ensured that fragmented units remained culturally coordinated and economically productive. The result was a kind of controlled chaos that proved remarkably durable: the Holy Roman Empire lasted from 962 to 1806, nearly nine centuries. The Classic Maya sustained their city-state system from roughly 250 to 900 CE, over six centuries. Both outlasted most centralized empires.

Understanding how two civilizations without contact arrived at the same political architecture, and why that architecture proved so durable in both cases, provides perhaps the strongest possible evidence that elite power mechanisms operate according to structural logic rather than cultural invention — that the patterns documented across this research series reflect not the spread of ideas but the constraints of the problems that political organization must solve.

I. Foundation Conditions: How Political Vacuums Produce Sacred Decentralization

Both the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya city-states emerged from periods of political fragmentation that created structural conditions favoring decentralized solutions over centralized ones. In both cases, the collapse or inadequacy of previous centralized authority left regional power holders in competition with each other, while ecological diversity created multiple resource bases that could sustain independent territorial units. The combination generated a distinctive political problem: how to coordinate across fragmented territories without any single authority possessing the military, economic, or administrative capacity to impose centralized control.

The Holy Roman Empire emerged from the fragmentation of Charlemagne's Carolingian Empire in the ninth century. The Treaty of Verdun in 843 divided the Frankish realm among Charlemagne's grandsons, and subsequent divisions further fractured Central European political authority. The result was a landscape of competing duchies, counties, bishoprics, and kingdoms with no unified political leadership. The stem duchies — Saxony, Franconia, Swabia, Bavaria, and Lotharingia — operated as effectively independent polities with their own military forces, legal traditions, and economic systems. External threats from Magyars, Vikings, and Slavic peoples created demand for coordinated defense that no single duchy could provide, but no duke possessed sufficient power to subordinate the others through force alone.

Otto I's victory over the Magyars at Lechfeld in 955 and his subsequent imperial coronation by the pope in 962 provided a solution that was elegant precisely because it did not require actual centralization. The imperial title gave Otto a claim to authority above all regional lords, but the claim rested on sacred legitimacy rather than administrative capacity. The emperor did not govern the duchies directly. He did not appoint their rulers, collect their taxes, or command their armies in peacetime. What he possessed was the ideological framework — divine mandate transmitted through papal coronation — that made his overlordship seem cosmically necessary rather than politically imposed. The duchies retained their autonomy while accepting nominal subordination to an authority whose power was more symbolic than administrative.

The Classic Maya emerged from a different but structurally analogous process. During the Late Preclassic period (roughly 400 BCE to 250 CE), Maya society transitioned from village-based chiefdoms to more complex political entities centered on growing urban cores. Unlike the Aztec or Inca trajectories, where centralized empires eventually absorbed regional polities, the Maya lowlands produced a constellation of independent city-states that never unified under a single political authority. The ecological diversity of the Maya region — tropical rainforest, seasonal wetlands, highland areas, coastal zones — created multiple distinct resource bases that could sustain independent polities. No single ecological zone was so dominant that control of it would enable conquest of the others. Jade came from the highlands of Guatemala. Obsidian came from volcanic regions. Salt came from coastal areas. Cacao flourished in specific lowland zones. This resource diversity meant that every city-state controlled something valuable but no city-state controlled everything necessary, creating conditions for trade-based interdependence rather than conquest-based unification.

The structural parallel is precise: in both cases, political fragmentation combined with resource diversity to create conditions where centralization was neither feasible nor necessary for elite

prosperity. Regional power holders could maintain independence because they controlled distinct resource bases. But they also needed coordination mechanisms — for defense against external threats in Europe, for trade and ritual coordination in Mesoamerica — that required some overarching framework beyond military force. In both cases, the solution was sacred authority: an ideological framework that positioned political hierarchy as cosmic necessity, creating voluntary compliance without requiring administrative centralization.

II. The Divine Ruler as Structural Solution: Emperor and K'uhul Ajaw

The most striking convergence between the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya is the figure of the sacred ruler — the emperor and the k'uhul ajaw respectively — who functions not as an administrative chief but as a cosmic intermediary whose authority derives from divine sanction rather than bureaucratic capacity. Both figures occupied positions that were simultaneously powerful and constrained: powerful because sacred legitimacy placed them above ordinary political competition, constrained because their actual administrative reach was limited by the autonomy of subordinate territorial units. This paradox — supreme ideological authority combined with limited practical power — was not a bug but a feature. It was what made the system work.

The Holy Roman Emperor received his authority through a chain of sacred legitimation that connected earthly governance to divine will. The imperial title claimed succession from both the Roman Empire and Charlemagne's Christian universal monarchy. The emperor was crowned by the pope (until the sixteenth century), making his authority an expression of God's plan for earthly governance. Court theologians developed elaborate frameworks demonstrating that the imperial office was divinely ordained — not merely a political arrangement but a necessary component of cosmic order. Resistance to imperial authority was therefore not merely political rebellion but transgression against God's will.

Yet the emperor's actual governance capacity was remarkably limited. He had no permanent capital for most of the empire's history, instead traveling between residences in an itinerant court. He had no standing army under his direct command (until late periods). He had no centralized tax collection system. He could not appoint or remove the rulers of the major territories without their consent or the consent of their peers. His legislative power was shared with the Imperial Diet (Reichstag), where territorial rulers, ecclesiastical lords, and free cities all had representation. The emperor was, in Peter H. Wilson's formulation, "first among equals" — supreme in dignity but dependent on cooperation for actual governance.

The Maya k'uhul ajaw occupied a structurally identical position within his city-state and the broader Maya political landscape. The title itself — "divine lord" — encoded the same fusion of political authority and cosmic status that the imperial title represented in Europe. The k'uhul ajaw was not merely a political ruler but a sacred being, thought to act as a mediator between

the mortal realm and the supernatural world. His most important functions were religious: leading ceremonies, performing bloodletting rituals that opened communication with ancestors and deities, timing agricultural and military activities according to cosmic cycles. His authority derived not from bureaucratic appointment but from divine lineage — ruling dynasties traced their ancestry to creator deities and primordial cosmic events, making their authority an expression of cosmic order rather than political arrangement.

Like the emperor, the k'uhul ajaw's actual administrative reach was constrained. Each Maya city-state operated independently, with its own ruling dynasty, its own military forces, its own tributary relationships with subordinate settlements. No k'uhul ajaw governed all the Maya. Even the most powerful rulers — those of Tikal, Calakmul, Copán, Palenque — exercised hegemony over neighboring cities through tributary relationships and military alliance rather than direct administrative control. Subordinate rulers (sajal, batab) managed their own territories with considerable autonomy, answering to the k'uhul ajaw but not governed by him in any modern administrative sense.

The structural parallel extends to how sacred authority was performed and displayed. Both the emperor and the k'uhul ajaw invested enormous resources in making their cosmic status visible through monumental architecture, elaborate ceremony, and controlled artistic production. Imperial cathedrals and palace complexes in Europe served the same function as stepped pyramids and ceremonial plazas in Maya cities: they made divine authority physically manifest in stone, creating environments that communicated cosmic power to literate and illiterate populations alike. The Gothic cathedral at Aachen and Temple I at Tikal served identical political functions despite being built from different materials in different styles for different cosmological reasons. Both said: the ruler who built this commands cosmic forces that ordinary people cannot access.

Both rulers also used genealogical narrative to anchor their authority in cosmic time. Holy Roman Emperors traced their legitimacy back through Charlemagne to the Roman Empire and ultimately to divine appointment. Maya k'uhul ajaw traced their lineages back through royal ancestors to creator deities and the events of cosmic creation itself. In both cases, the genealogical narrative served the same function: it positioned current political arrangements as continuations of cosmic history rather than contingent human inventions, making resistance to ruling authority equivalent to opposition against the fundamental order of reality.

III. The Interpretive Class: Bishops and Priests as Parallel Infrastructure

No sacred authority system can function without an interpretive class — specialists who possess exclusive access to sacred knowledge and whose institutional interests align with maintaining the ruler's divine legitimacy. Both the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya

developed such classes, and despite operating within entirely different religious traditions, these classes served identical structural functions.

In the Holy Roman Empire, the Christian clergy — and particularly the bishops — constituted the interpretive class. Bishops were educated men, usually from aristocratic families, who commanded institutional resources (diocesan revenues, monastic holdings, educational infrastructure) and possessed the theological expertise to legitimate or challenge imperial authority. The emperor's relationship with the episcopate was symbiotic and strategic. Through the Ottonian and Salian system of imperial church appointments (Investiture), emperors selected bishops who would be loyal to imperial interests, effectively integrating the ecclesiastical hierarchy into the imperial administrative apparatus. Bishops served as imperial administrators in their territories, providing literate governance that secular lords often could not match. In return, bishops received imperial protection, territorial authority, and the resources that came with governing wealthy dioceses.

This system created an interpretive class whose institutional survival depended on the continuation of sacred imperial authority. Bishops who owed their appointments to the emperor had material incentives to legitimate his cosmic claims. The theology they taught in cathedral schools and monastic institutions reinforced imperial ideology. The ceremonies they performed — coronations, consecrations, feast-day liturgies — enacted imperial sacred authority before populations who experienced divine truth through ritual rather than reading. The physical infrastructure they controlled — cathedrals, monasteries, scriptoria, schools — constituted the empire's primary information network and educational system. Controlling the bishops meant controlling the mechanisms through which populations understood cosmic order and their place within it.

The Classic Maya developed a structurally identical interpretive class through their priestly-scribal elite. Maya priests possessed exclusive knowledge of the ritual calendar systems — the 260-day Tzolk’in, the 365-day Haab', and the Long Count — that governed agricultural timing, ceremonial scheduling, and cosmic interpretation. They could read and write the hieroglyphic script that recorded dynastic histories, astronomical observations, and ritual prescriptions. They performed the ceremonies — bloodletting rituals, sacrifice, astronomical observations, calendrical calculations — that maintained the cosmic relationships on which agricultural prosperity and political stability supposedly depended.

Like the Christian bishops, Maya priests' institutional survival depended on the continuation of the sacred political system they served. Their exclusive knowledge of writing, astronomy, and ritual gave them indispensable roles that existed only within the framework of divine kingship. Without the k'uhul ajaw, there would be no need for the elaborate ritual performances that justified priestly authority and consumed priestly expertise. Without the cosmological framework that positioned rulers as cosmic intermediaries, there would be no demand for the astronomical and calendrical knowledge that priests monopolized. The priestly class and the divine king legitimated each other in the same way that the episcopate and the emperor legitimated each other in Europe.

The information monopoly operated identically in both cases, despite being built from completely different materials. In Europe, Latin literacy restricted access to theological, legal, and administrative texts to the clergy and a small educated secular elite. Populations experienced Christianity through vernacular preaching, visual art, architectural spectacle, and ritual participation — all mediated by clerical specialists who controlled interpretation. The stained glass windows of a Gothic cathedral told biblical stories to illiterate congregations in terms that reinforced both ecclesiastical and imperial authority, much as hieroglyphic inscriptions on Maya stelae told cosmological stories to populations who could not read them but understood their political significance through the public rituals that accompanied their dedication.

In Mesoamerica, hieroglyphic literacy was restricted to the scribal elite — a subset of the ruling class — while populations experienced the cosmological framework through monumental architecture, public ceremony, ritual performance, and artistic display. The carved stelae that recorded dynastic histories and astronomical events were not meant to be read by ordinary people any more than Latin legal charters were. They were records for the elite and monuments for the masses — physical demonstrations of cosmic knowledge and divine connection that communicated sacred authority through visual spectacle rather than textual comprehension.

IV. Competitive Cooperation: Why Fragmentation Served Elite Interests

Perhaps the most counterintuitive convergence between the two systems is their shared discovery that political fragmentation could serve elite interests more effectively than centralization. Both the Holy Roman Empire and the Maya city-states maintained decentralized political structures for centuries not because they failed to centralize but because decentralization provided advantages that centralization could not match. Understanding these advantages explains why structurally similar solutions emerged independently in civilizations without contact.

The first advantage was resilience. Decentralized systems are harder to destroy than centralized ones because there is no single point of failure. The Holy Roman Empire survived catastrophes that would have destroyed a centralized state: the Investiture Controversy, the Great Interregnum (1254-1312, when no universally recognized emperor held power for nearly sixty years), the Reformation's shattering of religious unity, and the Thirty Years' War's devastation of Central European population and economy. In each case, the empire's decentralized structure meant that destruction of the center did not mean destruction of the whole. Territorial lords continued governing their domains. Bishops continued administering their dioceses. Cities continued trading. The imperial framework could be reconstituted because the constituent parts survived independently.

The Maya city-state system demonstrated identical resilience. Individual cities experienced political collapse, military defeat, and dynastic extinction repeatedly throughout the Classic Period, but the broader Maya civilizational system survived and even thrived. When Tikal was defeated by Caracol and Calakmul in the sixth century and experienced a period of political eclipse, Maya civilization did not collapse — other cities flourished. When individual dynasties were overthrown, the institution of divine kingship persisted because it was not dependent on any single lineage. The system's decentralization meant that local failures remained local, never cascading into systemic collapse (until the Terminal Classic period when multiple reinforcing crises overwhelmed the system's adaptive capacity).

The second advantage was the prevention of internal challenge. In centralized states, ambitious subordinates can target the center — seize the capital, capture the ruler, control the bureaucracy — and thereby capture the entire state apparatus. Decentralized systems offer no such opportunity. In the Holy Roman Empire, there was no single capital to seize, no centralized bureaucracy to capture, no unified military to subvert. An ambitious duke who defeated the emperor still faced dozens of other territorial lords, hundreds of independent cities, and a vast ecclesiastical infrastructure that operated autonomously. The Investiture Controversy demonstrated this: even when the emperor and the pope were locked in existential conflict, the constituent territories continued functioning, and neither party could destroy the other because neither controlled the system's distributed power structure.

The Maya system prevented internal challenge through the same mechanism. No single k'uhul ajaw could conquer all the others because the system's geographical and political fragmentation made universal conquest logistically impossible. Even the most powerful Maya states — Tikal at its height, Calakmul at its most expansive — never achieved anything approaching centralized control over the Maya lowlands. Their hegemony operated through tributary relationships and military alliances that could be challenged, renegotiated, or broken by subordinate states. This prevented the concentration of power that might have enabled a single ruler to transform the system into a centralized empire and thereby threaten the class interests of regional elites.

The third advantage was that competitive fragmentation drove innovation without threatening the system itself. In the Holy Roman Empire, competition among territorial rulers for prestige, economic development, and administrative sophistication produced remarkable diversity in governance, culture, and economic policy. The Hanseatic League's commercial innovations, the university system's intellectual achievements, the architectural competition between cities and principalities — all emerged from competitive fragmentation. Habsburg marriage diplomacy, perhaps the most sophisticated dynasty-building strategy in European history, was possible only because the fragmented political landscape created opportunities for strategic alliance-building that a centralized state would have rendered unnecessary.

Maya city-states competed through monumental architecture, ritual elaboration, artistic production, and military display in ways that drove cultural innovation to extraordinary heights. The architectural achievements of Tikal, Palenque, Copán, and Calakmul were products of competitive pressure: each k'uhul ajaw sought to demonstrate cosmic authority through building projects that surpassed those of rivals. The sophistication of Maya astronomical observation,

calendrical calculation, and hieroglyphic writing was driven partly by competitive pressure among scribal elites serving different courts. This competition generated civilizational achievements that a centralized empire might never have produced because centralization removes the competitive pressure that drives innovation.

The crucial insight is that in both cases, competition operated within a shared ideological framework that prevented it from becoming destructive. Holy Roman territorial lords competed fiercely but within a feudal legal system and Christian cosmological framework that provided rules of engagement and mechanisms for dispute resolution. Maya city-states warred against each other but within a shared cosmological system that prescribed proper conduct in warfare, appropriate treatment of captives, and legitimate claims to authority. The shared ideology enabled competition while constraining it — producing innovation without dissolution. This is what made fragmentation serve elite interests: it generated dynamism while preventing any single actor from accumulating enough power to overturn the system that sustained elite privilege collectively.

V. Wealth Extraction Through Sacred Obligation

Both systems developed wealth extraction mechanisms that framed resource transfer as religious duty rather than political coercion, achieving remarkably high compliance rates with remarkably low enforcement costs. The structural logic was identical: when populations believe that their labor and resources serve cosmic purposes rather than elite consumption, resistance becomes not just politically dangerous but spiritually threatening.

In the Holy Roman Empire, wealth extraction operated through feudal obligations embedded within a Christian framework of divine social order. Peasants owed tithes to the Church — one-tenth of their production — as religious duty commanded by God. They owed labor services, rents, and various fees to their feudal lords as part of a social order that the Church taught was divinely ordained. The three-estates ideology (those who pray, those who fight, those who work) presented systematic inequality as functional division necessary for cosmic harmony. Each estate served God through its appointed role: clergy through prayer and spiritual care, nobility through military protection and justice, peasantry through productive labor that sustained the other two estates. This framework transformed extraction into service and inequality into divine plan.

Maya wealth extraction operated through a cosmological framework that was structurally identical despite being entirely unrelated in content. The k'uhul ajaw's ritual responsibilities — maintaining cosmic order, ensuring agricultural fertility, communicating with divine forces — required resources. Tribute from subordinate communities was framed not as political extraction but as necessary contribution to cosmic maintenance. Labor for monumental construction projects — pyramids, plazas, causeways, reservoirs — served the gods and maintained the cosmic relationships on which agricultural prosperity depended. The ritual economy transformed

resource transfer into sacred participation: communities that contributed labor and tribute were not being exploited but were participating in the cosmic activities that sustained their world.

Both systems reinforced extraction through ceremonial redistribution that made elite consumption appear as communal benefit. The Holy Roman Emperor's itinerant court, moving between residences across the empire, consumed enormous resources provided by the territories he visited. But these visits were also occasions for dispensing justice, confirming privileges, and conducting ceremonies that reinforced social bonds. The host territory bore the cost but gained the prestige and practical benefits of imperial attention. Similarly, Maya k'uhul ajaw redistributed resources through public ceremonies, feasts, and ritual distributions that made elite consumption visible as communal activity. The great plazas of Maya cities functioned as spaces where tribute was transformed into spectacle — into performances that populations experienced as religious participation rather than exploitation.

VI. The Logic of Convergence: Why Structural Conditions Produce Structural Similarities

The convergence between the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya cannot be explained by cultural diffusion, parallel religious traditions, shared intellectual heritage, or any mechanism of transmission. These civilizations developed independently in complete isolation from each other. Their convergence must therefore be explained by the structural conditions they shared and the limited set of solutions available for the problems those conditions created.

The shared conditions can be specified precisely. First, both operated in environments of political fragmentation following the collapse or inadequacy of centralized authority. Second, both occupied ecologically diverse territories where multiple resource bases supported independent political units. Third, both faced the problem of coordinating across fragmented territories without the administrative capacity for direct centralized control. Fourth, both contained competing elites who needed legitimation frameworks that transcended military force. Fifth, both possessed interpretive classes — clergy in Europe, priests and scribes in Mesoamerica — whose specialized knowledge could be mobilized for political legitimation.

Given these conditions, the solution space narrows dramatically. Centralization was infeasible because no single power holder commanded sufficient resources to subordinate all others. Pure military competition was unsustainable because it destroyed the productive capacity that made elite prosperity possible. Trade-based coordination required some overarching framework of trust and obligation that pure commercial calculation could not provide. The remaining option — sacred legitimation of a decentralized hierarchy — emerged not because anyone designed it but because it was the only configuration that resolved all the constraints simultaneously.

Sacred authority provided legitimation that transcended local military power. Decentralization preserved elite autonomy while enabling coordination. Shared ideology created cultural unity

without requiring political unification. Competitive cooperation drove innovation while preventing destructive conflict. Interpretive classes provided administrative infrastructure while reinforcing legitimation. Wealth extraction framed as religious duty achieved compliance without requiring extensive coercive apparatus. Each element of the system reinforced the others, creating a self-sustaining configuration that, once established, proved remarkably difficult to overturn from either inside or outside.

This is not a claim that the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya were "the same." They were profoundly different in every particular — in religious content, artistic expression, technological capability, environmental context, and historical trajectory. The claim is more precise and more important: that the structural logic of their political organization was identical because the structural logic of their political problems was identical. Different cultural materials were assembled into the same architectural pattern because the pattern was demanded by the constraints of the situation, not by the properties of the materials.

VII. Divergent Trajectories and Shared Vulnerabilities

Despite their structural convergence, the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya experienced different long-term trajectories that illuminate both the strengths and the vulnerabilities of sacred decentralized systems.

The Classic Maya system collapsed during the Terminal Classic period (roughly 800-1000 CE), though "collapse" is misleading — what occurred was the abandonment of the southern lowland cities and the dissolution of the divine kingship institution in those regions, while Maya civilization continued in the northern Yucatán and highland Guatemala under modified political forms. The collapse appears to have resulted from the convergence of multiple stresses: environmental degradation from intensive agriculture, prolonged drought, intensified warfare that exceeded the system's capacity for managed competition, and growing elite populations that strained the extraction systems supporting them. The decentralized system that had provided resilience against individual shocks proved vulnerable to simultaneous, mutually reinforcing crises that required coordinated response — precisely the capability that decentralization inhibited.

The Holy Roman Empire survived far longer — until Napoleon's reorganization dissolved it in 1806 — but it too eventually proved unable to adapt to changed circumstances. The Reformation shattered the religious unity that had provided the system's ideological foundation, though the empire survived by institutionalizing religious division through the Peace of Augsburg (1555) and the Peace of Westphalia (1648). The rise of centralized nation-states — France, England, eventually Prussia — demonstrated that centralized administrative capacity could generate military and economic power that decentralized sacred systems could not match. The empire's famous weakness — Voltaire's quip that it was "neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire" — was precisely the characteristic that had once been its strength. The fragmentation

that had prevented internal challenge and enabled competitive innovation also prevented the coordinated mobilization of resources that modern warfare and economic competition demanded.

Both trajectories reveal the same underlying vulnerability: sacred decentralized systems excel at maintaining stability and enabling innovation within established parameters but struggle to adapt when fundamental parameters change. The Maya system could not coordinate a collective response to simultaneous environmental, demographic, and military crises. The Holy Roman system could not coordinate a collective response to the rise of centralized nation-states that could mobilize resources on scales that fragmented territories could not match. In both cases, the same mechanism — decentralization — that had sustained the system for centuries became the obstacle to the adaptation that changed circumstances required.

This pattern echoes the finding from the Diocletian-Tokugawa comparison: political systems that prioritize stability tend to develop mechanisms that resist the very changes that eventually become necessary for survival. The sacred decentralized polity is the most durable form of political organization documented in this research series, but its durability comes at the cost of adaptive flexibility. The structures that prevent internal overthrow also prevent internal transformation.

Conclusion: What Convergence Reveals About Power

The convergence between the Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya provides what may be the strongest possible evidence for the structural thesis that underlies this research series. When two civilizations with zero contact, zero cultural exchange, and zero shared intellectual heritage independently develop identical political architectures — sacred rulers mediating between cosmic forces and earthly populations, interpretive classes monopolizing access to divine knowledge, competitive elite networks managing fragmentation through shared ideology, wealth extraction framed as religious duty, monumental architecture as legitimation spectacle — the explanation cannot be cultural. It must be structural.

The implication is that elite power mechanisms are not inventions that spread from culture to culture but emergent properties of certain configurations of political, ecological, and social conditions. When those conditions obtain, the mechanisms appear — not because anyone designs them but because the constraints of the situation eliminate alternative configurations. The divine king is not a Mesoamerican concept or a European concept. It is a structural solution to the problem of legitimate authority in fragmented polities, and it appears wherever that problem appears because the solution space is narrow enough that independent discoverers converge on the same answer.

This convergence also reveals something about the relationship between belief and power that individual case studies cannot demonstrate as forcefully. In any single case — the Holy Roman

Empire alone, or the Maya alone — it is possible to argue that the sacred political system reflects genuine religious conviction rather than strategic deployment of ideology for political purposes. Perhaps the emperor really was God's representative. Perhaps the k'uhul ajaw really did communicate with cosmic forces. But when two completely independent civilizations develop identical functional systems using entirely different religious materials, the religious content becomes explanatorily secondary to the political function. What matters is not whether Jupiter or Itzamnaaj is the true deity but that positioning the ruler as divine intermediary solves the problem of legitimate authority in decentralized systems. The convergence reveals the function by holding the content constant as a variable that changes while the structural outcome remains the same.

None of this means that religious belief is "merely" political. People in both civilizations genuinely believed in the cosmological frameworks that sustained their political systems. The sincerity of belief is not in question. What the convergence reveals is that sincere belief and political function are not mutually exclusive — that belief systems can be simultaneously genuine expressions of how people understand the cosmos and functional mechanisms that sustain particular configurations of political power. The structural analysis does not debunk belief; it contextualizes it within the patterns of power that belief simultaneously reflects and sustains.

The Holy Roman Empire and the Classic Maya, separated by an ocean and connected by nothing except the logic of the problems they faced, built the same political architecture from different cultural materials. That convergence is the pattern this entire research series has documented, compressed into a single comparison so stark that the structural logic becomes undeniable.

Bibliography

Primary Sources — Holy Roman Empire

Sachsenspiegel (Saxon Mirror). 13th century legal compilation.

Schwabenspiegel (Swabian Mirror). Imperial legal traditions.

Golden Bull of 1356 (Charles IV's electoral regulations).

Widukind of Corvey. *Res Gestae Saxonicae* (Saxon Deeds). 10th century.

Thietmar of Merseburg. *Chronicon*. Early 11th century.

Otto of Freising. *Chronica* and *Gesta Friderici*. 12th century.

Primary Sources — Classic Maya

Popol Vuh: The Sacred Book of the Maya. Trans. Allen J. Christenson. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.

Chilam Balam Books. Trans. Ralph L. Roys. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.

Graham, Ian. *Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Peabody Museum, 1975-2006.

Landa, Diego de. *Relación de las cosas de Yucatán*. c. 1566. Trans. Alfred M. Tozzer. Cambridge: Peabody Museum, 1941.

Secondary Sources — Holy Roman Empire

Wilson, Peter H. *The Holy Roman Empire: A Thousand Years of Europe's History*. London: Allen Lane, 2016.

Whaley, Joachim. *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire*. 2 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Stollberg-Rilinger, Barbara. *The Emperor's Old Clothes: Constitutional History and the Symbolic Language of the Holy Roman Empire*. New York: Berghahn, 2015.

Leyser, Karl. *Rule and Conflict in Early Medieval Society*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.

Reuter, Timothy. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 800-1056*. London: Longman, 1991.

Fichtenau, Heinrich. *The Carolingian Empire*. Trans. Peter Munz. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

Secondary Sources — Classic Maya

Demarest, Arthur Andrew. *Ancient Maya: The Rise and Fall of a Rainforest Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Martin, Simon, and Nikolai Grube. *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens*. 2nd ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 2008.

Schele, Linda, and David Freidel. *A Forest of Kings: The Untold Story of the Ancient Maya*. New York: William Morrow, 1990.

Schele, Linda, and Mary Ellen Miller. *The Blood of Kings: Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art*. Fort Worth: Kimbell Art Museum, 1986.

Fash, William L. *Scribes, Warriors and Kings: The City of Copán and the Ancient Maya*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1991.

Marcus, Joyce. *Emblem and State in the Classic Maya Lowlands*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1976.

Webster, David. *The Fall of the Ancient Maya*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2002.

Comparative and Theoretical

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power*. Vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Bryan, Thomas J. *Analytical Framework for Elite Power and Belief Systems*. Version 3.0. Unpublished manuscript, 2025.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2025 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

This case study is part of the *Elite Power and Belief Systems* research series.